

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on February 26, 2007.

Claims 9, 21 and 27 are amended, and claims 1 – 7, 11 – 19, 23 – 25 and 28 are canceled; as a result, claims 8 – 10, 20 – 22, 26, 27 and 29 are now pending in this application.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 8, 20 and 29 were allowed.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and is also believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency on claim 9.

Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 20 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 22 and 26 depend from claim 21 and are also believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 21.

Claim 27 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 27 has been amended to include the limitations of base claim 13 and intervening claims 14 and 21 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Krause (U.S. 3,626,046). Claims 1 – 3 and 5 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1 – 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Krause has been overcome.

Claims 1-2, 11-17 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Seelandt (U.S. 3,177,672). Claims 1 – 2, 11 – 17 and 23 – 25 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1 – 2, 11 – 17 and 23 – 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Seelandt has been overcome.

Claims 1-7, 13-14, 16-19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Lessard et al. (U.S. 5,862,671). Claims 1-7, 13-14, 16-19 and 25 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-7, 13-14, 16-19 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Lessard has been overcome.

Claims 13-14, 21 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Kliphuis (U.S. 3,582,805). Claims 13 – 14 have been cancelled. Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 20, which has been stated to be allowable and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim depends from claim 21 and is believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency on claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13-14, 21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Kliphuis has been overcome.

Claims 13 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Longworth et al. (U.S. 5,687,574). Claims 13 and 24 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) anticipation by Longworth has been overcome.

Claims 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Lorimer (U.S. 5,855,118). Claims 13 and 23 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) anticipation by Lorimer has been overcome.

#### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lessard et al. in view of Muldowney et al. (U.S. 6,257,001). Claim 15 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

Claims 9-10 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lessard et al. in view of Sukenobu (U.S. 4,607,493).

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8, which was stated to be allowable and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and is also believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency on claim 9.

Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 20, which was stated to be allowable and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 22 and 26 depend from claim 21 and are also believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 9-10 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kliphuis (U.S. 3, 582,805) in view of Feinstein et al. (U.S. 3,533,011). As discussed above, claim 26 is believed to be allowable at least because of its dependency on claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Longworth et al. (U.S. 5,687,574) as discussed in relation to claim 13 above and further in view of Bailey (U.S. 5,551,244). Claim 28 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or

assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (480) 659-3314 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID R. SAR ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(480) 659-3314

Date 4-19-2007

By / Gregory J. Gornie  
Gregory J. Gornie  
Reg. No. 36,530

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 19 day of April 2007.

KIMBERLY BROWN

Name

Kimberly Brown  
Signature